DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 022 261 EA 001 626

FRONTIERS IN SCHOOL LEADERSHIP. A SYNTHESIZED REPORT OF A SEMINAR.

California Univ., Santa Barbara. Center for Coordinated Education.
Spons Agency-Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.
Pub Date Jan 68
Note-66p.; Papers presented at a Conference on the Frontier in School Leadership (Santa Barbara, California, January 9-12, 1968).
EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$2.72
Descriptors-*ADMINISTRATOR ROLE, *EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION, *EDUCATIONAL CHANGE, *LEADERSHIP RESPONSIBILITY, ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE, PRINCIPALS, *TEACHER ADMINISTRATOR RELATIONSHIP, TEACHER MILITANCY

This document contains summaries of and a synthesis of the commentary on papers presented at the Conference on the Frontier in School Leadership. The authors and their papers are (1) John I. Goodlad, "Middle Management in Educational Change: Hope or Despair?" (2) Egon G. Guba, "Missing Roles in School Leadership: Matters Tended and Untended," (3) J. W. Getzels, "Creative Administration and Organizational Change: An Essay in Theory," (4) Robert M. Gagne, "Desirable Changes in the School: Some Suggestions for Leaders and Followers," (5) Gary Gschwind, "The Voice of the Teacher: A Song of Protest," (6) Edward J. Meade, Jr., "The Cost of Leadership," (7) Louis J. Rubin, "The Principal and the Teacher: The Risks of Autonomy," (8) Norman J. Boyan, "The Two Worlds of Administration and Leadership: The Ideadogical Curtain," and (9) Abraham S. Fischler, "The Frontier in School Leadership: Gentlemen, Start Your Engines." (HW)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

FRONTIERS IN SCHOOL LEADERSHIP

A Synthesized Report
of a Seminar Sponsored by the
Center for Coordinated Education
University of California, Santa Barbara
January 9-12, 1968

The Center for Coordinated Education
is supported by a grant from
The Ford Foundation

FRONTIERS IN SCHOOL LEADERSHIP

In the last two decades or so, America has become seriously concerned about her system of education. While the schools have always had their critics and reformers, preoccupation with school improvement has increased strikingly in the recent past. Although many factors have contributed to increased public interest in better schooling, the major thrust has stemmed from three principal elements: first, there are inadequacies in the school system--as in any other institution--which need correction; second, societal changes, particularly those relating to domestic and foreign strife, have posed new problems for education; third, technological advances have created new alternatives and potentials which necessitate some reorganization of the school before they can be accommodated.

Thus, many of the solutions to school problems depend upon the reorganization of the present structure of the school and upon new kinds of administrative behavior. The hallmark of our present administrative structure is a loose, somewhat hierarchical and authoritarian system of staff relationships which does not adequately separate the administrator's functions as manager and as instructional leader. In short, there is a need for a new approach to instructional leadership, one which emphasizes the upgrading of learning and instruction rather than management control. The school organization is weakened also

by an apparently unsatisfactory process for making decisions about instructional policy, and by a system of control which is based upon line authority rather than on professional competence. If we can judge from the available research data, the organizational structure also tends to restrict teacher professionalism and inhibit morale, communication, and collaborative staff action. If the improvement of the schools is to be a continuing phenomenon--if it is to take advantage of new knowledge about human learning and new devices for teaching the young--school leadership must face new tasks and modify both its purpose and its method.

Assuming, for the moment, the validity of these arguments, some important questions arise. Should we create new roles in our school leadership structure? What priorities should the principal or superintendent observe in the expenditure of his time and energy? What procedures will make for a sensible relationship between teacher and principal? Who should make decisions about what and how we teach; who should be accountable, and who should judge the results? In an effort to answer these and similar questions, the Center for Coordinated Education, a school improvement project on the Santa Barbara campus of the University of California, funded by the Ford Foundation, elected to convene a conference on the Frontier in School Leadership. The conference occurred in Santa Barbara, January 9-12, 1968. Eight papers were delivered, each criticized in a subsequent commentary. This report has been prepared for the conference participants. It contains a precis of each of the eight papers

and a synthesis of the commentary which followed. Complete transcriptions of each of the papers are currently in preparation and will be available at a later date. It should be clear that while the ideas set forth in this document are those of the writer, the language used to describe the ideas belongs to the editor.

The conference probably did not answer the important questions, but then conferences rarely do. It did, however, illuminate the problem somewhat and it also advanced a number of provocative solutions to the dilemna--solutions ranging from the extinction of the school principal and the creation of faculty academic senates in the elementary school to the assessment of teacher, principal, and school by measuring student achievement. The value and significance of these suggestions, of course, can only be decided after they are scrutinized and debated at greater length by many different people.

Louis J. Rubin
Seminar Director

MIDDLE MANAGEMENT IN EDUCATIONAL CHANGE: HOPE OR DESPAIR?

John I. Goodlad

Since 1947 I have been involved in the effort to improve American schooling, and in that period there has been a substantial amount of change, much of it for the good. But the process of change has been haphazard, and despite our efforts we know very little about how change is actually accomplished. In addition to being largely uncontrolled, educational change has not been at all sufficient to bring the schools in line with the guiding concepts in education which have emerged from two decades of thinking. If today's schools had implemented the best ideas from twenty years of effort, they would be characterized by the following: clear statements of objectives, instructional emphasis upon how to learn, recognition of individual differences, extensive use of learning theory in teaching, less attention to age grading, and intelligent use of new instructional materials and existing personnel. But a recent study of more than 70 schools conducted by myself and my colleagues at UCLA convinced us that these changes have not taken place.

In fact, instruction is still conducted largely in the traditional "teacher-talking" fashion, unguided by psychological principles and uncomplicated by recognition of individual

differences among pupils. Textbooks still dominate; tape recorders and films and recordings have made little headway. But despite what we saw as quite traditional instructional methods, teachers perceived their own methods as progressive, and principals on the whole were also satisfied with the instruction going on in their schools. Both teachers and principals were without a clear idea of the need for change, and were not involved in a dialogue about the mission of their schools--indeed, we rarely found a setting where such a dialogue could have taken place. So we have a long way to go in instructional improvement, and rhetorical appeals to leadership do not seem to be bringing us any closer to our goal.

Principals and teachers, surprisingly enough, are eager to know how to close the gap between the actual and the desirable. But so long as the norms and expectancies of educators are so built into the total structure, so long as upward mobility for individuals in the system depends on reinforcing the system, it is too much to ask of middle management leaders to perform in ways countercyclical to the system. Rhetorical appeals simply will not accomplish change. We need a total attack on the system, and this means we must understand the process of change itself. Out of this conviction grew our own response at UCLA, the League of Cooperating Schools.

Without placing all our chips on the school principal, we nonetheless concentrated our efforts in middle management. The key unit for educational change is the individual school, and the principal is the designated responsible leader of this unit.

To develop new programs it is necessary to convince administrators of the value of these changes, and this means convincing the principal. Of course, the system itself exercises enormous restraint upon these who would innovate, and we recognize that we must start not with the principal but with a countercyclical or redirecting system. For change to occur, certain rewards for the concerned individuals must be offered before new behaviors can be expected, and these rewards and this new countercyclical system must be insistent and sustained.

But these are only a few of the problems in introducing lasting change. With only exhortation and without a model, educators cannot be expected to make the deep changes we think necessary. As visitors to our UCLA operation often say, with some justice, our home situation presents obstacles to change that your particular operation does not need to confront. In answer to such complaints we created a countervailing system (which we called the League of Cooperating Schools) to provide a model for change within restricting systems. So that this model was not so outside the existing structure of education as to appear too drastic, thereby generating opposition, we constructed a system made up almost entirely of parts of the existing system by inviting 18 different schools to join together. We injected funds and staff, identified the school principals as the change leaders in each school, and tried to stimulate them to work on a more concerted basis with their own faculties.

What we had done was to put these principals in a new structure--a new situation of activities, a new situation of expectations, and a new reward system. We hoped this structure would buttress the individual principal with respect to whatever pressures for or against change he may normally encounter. We have created a system for educational change composed largely of the component parts of existing systems in order that any change should very readily be able to transmit itself to other schools in the district. But our main concern is still to find out something about the change process, and we have placed an envelope of educational research around this experiment. We are seeking to get a comprehensive description of what happens to the schools and what happens to the principals and teachers (so far we are not asking what happens to the students). We hope to monitor the changes that occur and to pose some further hypotheses as to the nature of the changes. The end product is not only 18 better schools, but a ripple effect outward to the other schools in the system. Again, the catalyst is to be built into the larger system in something of a counter-vailing way to change the traditional structure.

We hope to make an extensive analysis of the kinds of problems that are encountered in this kind of change enterprise, so that we may make some contribution to understanding change in general. With this understanding we may perhaps regain our sense of direction, and our efforts will be cumulative rather than haphazard. Along the way, we hope to begin to talk intelligently about the school principal as a viable agent of

change. We do not yet have an answer, but for us this is one of the very important questions: Should we have hope or despair with respect to the school principal as the potential leader and change agent in the school system?

Margaret Gill
Comments on Goodlad

I am less optimistic, even, than John Goodlad about the changes we have actually been able to make in American education in recent years. There was a time when I urged that we not change without caution and considerable forethought, but I have seen so little real change that I am about at the point of favoring change no matter in what direction!

With regard to the model developed at UCLA, I hope that John Goodlad and his associates are also training specialists with individual skills to go out to schools to help them develop <u>their</u> <u>own</u> models. A model devised by someone else may be a helpful vehicle to change in many cases, but in others local conditions will require different approaches.

Without questioning the value of such approaches, reflecting on the difficulties facing the principal who wishes to institute meaningful change may prepare us for present and future disappointments regarding the pace of improvement. In a recent publication of the University of Oregon Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, "The Normative World of The High School Principal," we are reminded that there is considerable ambiguity in the image a principal has of his own role in middle management; and his own view, clouded as it is, usually does not parallel the perception of him held by his

superiors or by the community. There are many reasons for this role confusion, not least of them recent developments in teacher negotiation which have cast doubt on the principal's authority. But role confusion is only one of the factors inhibiting principals from becoming the agents of change. How much time does a normal school day leave the principal for initiating change? And look at the things we expect of principals in that short and crowded day: that they be curriculum specialists, learning specialists, public relations specialists, plant managers, educational philosophers, and so forth. No wonder we haven't come very far along the path of school improvement.

MISSING ROLES IN SCHOOL LEADERSHIP: MATTERS TENDED AND UNTENDED

Egon G. Guba

The obvious need for drastic improvements in the nation's schools has led to strenuous and generally uncoordinated efforts to encourage and guide change. Many foundations have invested money in diffusion and demonstration programs, on the dubious assumption that we already know how to do a great deal better than we are doing. Great effort has gone into discovering the proper agent to convert research conclusions into practice. A parallel approach to change has been to encourage so-called grass-roots participation in improvement, on the assumption that the knowledge and ideas we need must be out there somewhere in the ranks of the almost two million practicing teachers and administrators.

So far, we have been disappointed with the value of our research findings and with the process of transmitting such knowledge as we have. We are also discouraged to find that busy practitioners do not have the time, energy or technical competence to translate such ideas as they might have into useful application. In view of these difficulties we have occasionally turned to the technique of instant money, as for example through the ESEA. Unfortunately such sums have typically

been used to buy more of the same old approaches, and we are not much closer to our goal.

What is lacking is a strategy for improvement, national in scope, built on viable assumptions and attuned to the realities of the educational and political world. Such a strategy must, I believe, consist of at least five components: research, information, development, diffusion, and utilization.

While existing research has not proved as useful as we hoped, school practice must sooner or later be placed on a scientific footing--thus the need for a Research Component. Some research problems will arise from theories or principles within the discipline and others from the practical arena. In either case, the researcher's task is not to apply his own findings. His outputs have little utility for anyone but other researchers, and the task of making them useful requires an Information Component. The central task of this agency is to store, systematize, and make available for retrieval a variety of information. This information may be codified and packaged into what I will call "information modules," a term designed to describe information packaged with its own interpretation. This is to avoid a major problem encountered in providing information only in the form of abstracts, bibliographies, and the like, which often leave the reader (user) to make an interpretation for which he is not technically qualified. The modules would not be mere summaries of existing information but authoritative interpretations of what the information "adds up to." If the user happens to have expertise in the area of

the module, fine; if not, he can make use of the offered interpretation, knowing it to be reliable.

A third major component in the proposed strategy is a Development Component. It is concerned with identification of educational needs, the invention of ways of meeting these needs, and the testing of the invention to be certain that it meets specifications. Developers will not only look to research for solutions, but to existing practice, precedent, and expert advice. Their solutions, in the form of inventions or innovations, require a Diffusion Component for their adoption. The task of this agency is to create awareness of possible improvements, demonstrate and assess the innovation, and train the persons who will be the ultimate users.

Finally, there is the component with the most relevance for our present discussion--the Utilization Component. This agency is concerned with selecting from available innovations those which show greatest promise of meeting local needs, and servicing the designated solution until it becomes an accepted part of the local program.

Do any of these components now exist? Some of them have in fact appeared, although not in the exact form outlined here. The ERIC centers represent a step toward the Information Component, the regional educational laboratories approximate what is meant by Development Centers, and certain Title III projects resemble the Diffusion Centers while others resemble Utilization Centers. But massive support is needed to expand the proposed system to its minimal required size. Some

$100,000,000 a year could profitably be expended on research alone; a central information agency plus twenty satellites could be supported for five million and forty million (two million for each satellite); I would also suggest twenty regional development centers, supported at the level of five million a year, and 100 diffusion agencies, supported at two million annually, and about 1,500 utilization centers supported at the level of one-third million per year. The total budget for this system would be on the order of 900 million dollars, which is little more than one-quarter of the current total federal expenditure per annum on education, and easily within our means.

I have been describing an ideal national system for school improvement. Something of this sort is already emerging and, in one form or another, will surely be a feature of the educational scene in the future. A number of other evolving circumstances will cause fundamental changes in the schools' organization, structure, and program. Most of these are familiar already: shortages of trained personnel, the negotiations movement in teaching, and a tendency to return control of the school to the local patron. Perhaps the most important is the effort to individualize instruction, which has been so stimulated by recent breakthroughs in technology. The developments I have described are sure to strike at some of our most cherished stereotypes about schools. In the remainder of this paper, my concern will be with roles in the educational establishment, and with the alterations which may be expected

in existing roles as a result of the dynamics of modern school development.

The role of the teacher seems to me to be the most affected by current events. It is likely that electronic or mechanical equipment will assume the information purveying function of teachers, freeing them to play out their role in essentially one-to-one relationships or small group situations with students. An important function of teachers will then be diagnosis of individual student progress and prescription for further growth. When the prescription is made it will be carried out by a variety of personnel, much as the prescription of a physician is implemented by many specialists. The teacher role will then be differentiated into a number of functions, such as diagnosticians, therapists, master teachers, and so on, acting as a team. New career lines and staffing patterns will emerge, and this will mean an increased professionalism.

Principals, despite much that has been written of late, will not abdicate their management role for an exclusive concern with instructional leadership. There are many reasons that the managerial role will persist. The principal is charged with responsibility for the entire operation of the school, and when things go wrong he is the one the Board and the public hold responsible. There is too much to be done, and too many public demands to satisfy, for him to concentrate on the classroom; he is and will continue to be locked into the administrative routines of the system, unable to delegate them to an assistant. And even when he can find the time to visit a classroom, the principal

is not often welcome and cannot get accurate information from his observations. Further, the resources for instructional improvement--staff, training, and so on--are not at his disposal. As a result, the principal will not abdicate his managerial role, but he will and should come to regard himself as a decision-maker about instructional practices, if not as an instructional leader itself. His ultimate effectiveness rests not on carrying out tasks himself but in making wise decisions, aided by outside agencies which are in a position to be of service.

The superintendent, much like the principal, will play an even less direct role in the instructional process than he does now. Rather he will become a link in tying the school system into the Utilization Component that serves his area. Like the principal he will be more nearly cast in the image of the professional executive whose job is to make wise decisions.

If the above analysis is correct, a number of new roles will be created to staff the national improvement system and to handle new functions at the practitioner level. In the Utilization Component, for example, we will need what I will call a context evaluator, to furnish continuous data about status and to sound alarms when that status varies from desirable levels. Many other new roles will be created, as improvements are generated, applied, and evaluated.

This is my perception of the moment and my prediction, and while it may change and the future may not work out exactly as I have outlined it here, I would be very surprised if future developments did not bear out these predictions, at least in principle.

R. Murray Thomas
Comments on Guba

The speculations Egon Guba has presented strike me as well-founded, and I share his hopes for the future of education. His paper was comprehensive, but let me address myself to only one part of the problem, the role of the principal. My main point deals with the complexity and variety of his function in American education, and we can best begin by asking three questions. What are the responsibilities of the school system? Who bears these responsibilities? What are the most important factors determining the ways that responsibility will be delegated?

The responsibilities of the school system include determining what shall be taught, who shall be taught and in what location, who shall teach, what materials and methods shall be used, and who shall evaluate the process. These responsibilities are borne by the voters, but obviously they are delegated downward through the school board, superintendent, principal, to the teacher. It is when we consider the factors determining the <u>ways</u> that responsibility will be delegated that we begin to see the reasons for the variety which characterizes the principalship today. Some delegation is conscious, but sometimes responsibility is captured from below (as with the AFT in the present situation), and sometimes by default when the responsibility is not shouldered. Much depends, of course, upon the

people involved. And among the many variables affecting the process, a lot depends on the number of students in the school. In large schools much will be delegated by one of the three processes mentioned above, and in small schools more will be retained by the principal. The capabilities of the teachers strongly affect matters of delegation as well, and an important factor is the personal interests of the principal.

The point should be clear, then, that "laboratory" or "pure" principalship is one thing, and actual school systems are another. Models of roles and functions often fail to take into account, and never make explicit, the importance of these variations.

CREATIVE ADMINISTRATION AND ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE: AN ESSAY IN THEORY

J. W. Getzels

Systematic concern with change in educational organizations is of comparatively recent vintage, and those concerned with change differ as to whether we are getting too little or too much of it. There is a tendency to feel that more "research"--by which is meant the collection of more and more empirical data--will somehow resolve the issue between those who criticize education for its faddism and those who complain of its rigidity. But this view of the nature and function of research is naive in the extreme. What is needed is not more raw data, or at least not more raw data alone, but more ideas--more analysis, synthesis, and conceptualization to give meaning to the data already collected and guidance to the collection of further data. If research on educational change is to be of significant value, it must be founded on conceptual models of organizational and administrative behavior, and of the nature of change itself, even if the perfection of such models is not yet attainable.

To comprehend behavior in an organization, it is necessary to understand the nature of the roles or normative expectations composing the institutions of the system, the personality and cognitive dispositions of the individuals occupying the roles

in the system, and the relationship of the organization to the other systems of the culture in which it is embedded. Organizational change involves these three interacting components of the system: the cultural, with the constituent ethos and values, the institutional, with the constituent roles and expectations, the individual, with the constituent personality and cognitive dispositions. Both methodical research directed to understanding organizational change, and administrative behavior directed to implementing change in practice must take into account the relation and interaction of these components of organizational behavior.

Three general types and sources of change may be identified. The first is what may be called enforced change, and has its source in pressures from the cultural and external component. The change is an "accommodation" by the internal levels of the system to a change in the external level of the system. Realignment of internal elements is founded in external pressure rather than internal need, and thus may lead to indiscriminate change or faddism. The second type of change is what may be called expedient change, and has its source in internal safeguards contrived against what are perceived as threats to existing institutions in the system. Realignment is not undertaken for reasons of principle, but is a "reaction" merely to maintain the system in situ, and may thus lead ultimately to rigidity and incapacity to respond to either external conditions or internal needs. The third type of change is what may be called essential change, and has its source neither in

accommodation to pressures from the cultural dimension of the system nor reaction to pressures in the internal dimension, but in "voluntarism" within the personal dimension of the system. The consequence is neither faddism nor rigidity, but creative inquiry and transformation on the basis of principle and need.

Current organization and system theory tends to be founded almost exclusively in equilibrium models along the lines of classical mechanics. Three crucial consequences derive from the mechanistic-equilibrium conception of organizations. The first is the belief that all relations in an organization are balanced, symmetrical, and linear. The second is that the predominant mode of analysis of organizational behavior tends to become structural rather than procedural. The third consequence, and the most important one in the present context, is that since the "natural" state of an organization is conceived to be equilibrium, it follows that change cannot be generated from within the internal system itself but must be induced by forces from the outside. It is no wonder that the characteristic form of educational change postulated in literature is what we have called <u>enforced change</u>.

But it is readily demonstrable that the crucial relations among the parts in a social system may not be balanced, symmetrical, and linear. They may be unbalanced, asymmetrical, and curvilinear. These unbalanced internal forces, asymmetrical relationships, and idiosyncratic personality and cognitive styles of individuals must be taken into account in the study of systematic change. A procedural model of analysis dealing

with the dynamics of organizational interaction, rather than a structural model dealing with the statics of organizational relationships derived from equilibrium theory, is more appropriate for understanding change.

It is not only organization theory that has been dominated by the mechanistic-equilibrium model, but also individual personality and cognitive theory. The prevailing equilibrium or homeostatic drive-reduction conception of the human being leads to the view that the individual is essentially passive, accommodative, or at most merely reactive. That is, he behaves only in response to a felt drive, an encountered problem, a presented stimulus, and then primarily to return to the presumed natural state of rest and equilibrium. But this homeostatic theory neglects a critical and readily observable tendency of the human being, his disposition to seek pleasure through encountering problems, raising the level of stimulation, and actively asserting his individuality. The characteristic mark of the fully-functioning person is not so much the passive possession of special technical skills or information compared to other persons, but the special stance he takes toward problem situations.

At the most general level, two types of problem situations may be distinguished: presented problem situations and discovered problem situations. In the former, the problem is given to the problem-solver, and it is presumed to have a known formulation, method of solution, and solution. In the latter, the problem is identified by the problem-solver himself, and is not presumed to have a known formulation, method of solution,

or solution. The modes of cognitive engagement in the one are principally memory and convergent thinking, in the other creative imagination and divergent thinking. What we have called enforced and expedient change typically involve presented problem situations, and what we have called essential change typically involves discovered problem situations.

The predominant attitude toward the administrator, and his own attitude toward his role, is that he deals primarily, if not exclusively, with presented problem situations. Indeed, it is believed that not only are present problems necessarily the chief business of the administrator, but that he must avoid discovered problem situations. But it is the discovery of new problems (even when no method of solution or solution seems immediately possible) that frequently defines what is most creative and productive--and leads most often to significant change. A characteristic difference between the non-creative and the creative artist or scientist is precisely this: the one deals with problems discovered by others, the second deals with problems he himself discovers. There must be a parallel distinction between non-creative and creative administration. The non-creative administrator waits for problems to happen--he deals with expedient change. The creative administrator deals not only with presented problems but with discovered problems as well, and achieves <u>essential change</u>--change which is not merely enforced or expedient but is founded in need and principle.

Richard L. Foster
Comments on Getzels

I could not agree more with Getzels on the apparent lack of causal relation between research and real educational change today. It is certainly true that the equilibrium method discourages change. I prefer Chris Argyris's model developed at Yale. As Argyris points out, if one administers schools as government and industry are managed, one may not get essential change. People may feel uncommitted to the task. The brightest quit, or take sick leave, or come to work without really being there. (They are in a sense drop-outs who are still in school.) Relationships need to be less rigid, with the distances between the bottom and the top of the hierarchy reduced. The system should be decentralized, and personalized in such a way that everyone serves as his own change agent. We use this method in my own district, and although I can't produce an organizational chart of our organization (and don't want to), it seemingly works. We do get essential change.

If essential change is to occur it must be paralleled by modifications in the organization of schools and in the way people conceive of their roles. Administrators must view themselves as teachers on special assignment rather than as wearers of gold braid. I am often asked, "with such a rationale of school administration and such a posture on leadership, are

you not bothered by teacher dissatisfaction and inefficiency?" My answer is that I wish my teachers to forget that I am the Superintendent. There is no reason to revere the administrator--the higher one ascends the administrative scale, the higher one is likely to score on the F-scale.

If we can judge by contemporary belief and practice, change will come about in one of two ways. Since World War II there has been a growing faith in the outside change agent, particularly in conjunction with pre-designed systems for achieving preconceived changes in instruction. But relatively little change seems to derive from such a process. An alternate and, to my mind, greatly superior method is the kindling of teacher enthusiasm, whatever the means. Pre-structured systems attempt to <u>mandate</u> change; teacher enthusiasm <u>generates</u> change. The United States Office of Education has apparently come to this belief as a consequence of some of its recent experiences. It now is willing to concede that change stemming from within the system can be as effective, if not more effective, than change which comes as an intrusion from outside the system.

There are certain guidelines to the induction of change. Each unit--each school--must be encouraged to regard itself as a separate change unit, and be allowed to seek change on its own rather than as a part of district-wide reform. People in the school or the system must be both comfortable enough and inspired enough to press for improvement. Those affected by the change must be involved from the beginning. These are indispensable prerequisites. Even where they all are operative,

one must expect resistance to change. It is normal and perhaps even healthy for groups to resist change, especially in California where agitation for change carries exceptional risks. The California culture seemingly is somewhat opposed to self-analysis and reform.

By way of conclusion, may I observe that the administrator who is worried about survival is doomed. An unwillingness to take carefully calculated risks is not only immature and irrational, it is also a strong guarantee of lethargy, complacency, and obsolescence.

DESIRABLE CHANGES IN THE SCHOOL: SOME SUGGESTIONS FOR LEADERS AND FOLLOWERS

Robert M. Gagne

It is commonly said in the world of education that research is either ineffective or very slow in bringing about the changes we all desire. Recent studies reinforce this common-sense judgment. Yet there remains a great faith in research, and the amount of research activity continues to increase. This optimism about the effectiveness of research in bringing about educational change may not be supported by experience, but it is supported by a shift in the nature of the relationship between research and the schools. The most promising characteristic of present-day research is its emphasis upon development. The end-product of research is increasingly expected to be a developed product of some sort rather than a report or an article. This emphasis upon development stresses the utilization of research, an attitude that is certain to modify the entire nature of the research function.

Since the aim of research will be to learn the effect of a given change or circumstance <u>in practice</u>, all parts of the school system may become involved. This will require negotiation and extensive planning, large amounts of money, and much more rigid standards of evaluation. The results of this application-oriented research will be there for all to see, not filed away

in a library. But the greater involvement of research in the operating life of the school is not the only change we may anticipate. The types of problems selected for investigation also are likely to change.

In the past, researchers often addressed themselves to problems where the outcome tended not only to have little effect on the school but where the outcome could also be easily predicted. This often meant that the problem had been poorly conceived; for example: "Will students' achievements improve if class size is reduced from 30 to 25?" One obviously expects some improvement, but that finding tells us little about the learning environment and fails to identify the effective change(s) in the conditions of instruction. Another popular research topic has been the study of curriculum modifications, but these too have had limited significance. Even when curriculum research has led to developmental change, this has usually meant a new textbook, and the impact of such innovation is not great. Curriculum projects rarely include serious attempts to assess their effects, and such assessment as we have seen shows that the results were only a fraction of those hoped for. As important as the new ideational content of a curricular change may be, the educational effects are often quite small.

But there are forms of research more likely to produce significant change in school practices. A central problem might be stated as follows: How can each student be provided with opportunities to develop maximally his talents, interests and capabilities? In the area of dealing with individual

difference, our schools, we will all admit, have largely failed. In recent years there has been a growing awareness of the problem of group instruction of differently gifted individuals, since study after study reports an enormous range of differences among age-graded students.

In some school systems this evidence has led to efforts to take such differences into account, such as the "homogeneous grouping" system in which students are grouped according to intelligence or levels of achievement. But continuing research indicates that the problem will not be solved so simply. A field study by Borg (1966), for example, shows that often the achievement of able students improved through such grouping but only at the cost of poorer achievement on the part of less able students. It is becoming clear from work on learning theory that learning is very idiosyncratic (cf. Gagne, 1967), implying that the grouping of students, on whatever basis, is accomplished at the expense of some of the students, whatever the average performance of the group as a whole. This points to the necessity of more individualistic instruction, matched to the individual's capabilities and designed to produce self-learners. Such instruction will be facilitated by certain kinds of hardware technology. The computer can be of great value in monitoring the individual, matching assignments to level of achievement, and in general promoting a more flexible scheduling. Audio and visual devices, such as the self-loading film projector and individual tape recorders, have a similar potential for individualizing instruction and qualifying the "mass" nature of modern education.

This kind of research and development has profound implications for the schools, some of which affect school administration. To facilitate individualized instruction, ways will be found to assess individual capabilities--in vocabulary or reading rate, for example, more precisely than in the past. Reports on student progress will become more sophisticated than the old letter-grade. The evaluation of student progress, diagnosing deficiencies and prescribing remedies for these deficiencies will become the most important function of teachers. The entire curriculum will become much more diverse and flexible to provide for individual differences, and teachers will be supplemented in instructional tasks by sub-professionals and even students. This means a more highly structured, complex organization, and managing it will be a very great challenge.

But the most challenging part of the new duties of the administrator has to do with leadership. As these changes crowd forward upon the school, the administrator (principal) must arrange for teachers to develop judgment in applying the results of research, and to improve their skill in diagnosing student weaknesses and assessing student progress. As for himself, the administrator will need to acquire skill in public relations, in managing a greater variety of personnel, and in evaluating his staff and his school. He will have to communicate his conviction that it is not stability which is the mark of a good school, but a sense of excitement, exploration, and challenge. He will cultivate these qualities in the school not simply to encourage variety for its own sake, but as a part of a purposeful striving for change in the direction of educational excellence.

Keith Goldhammer
Comments on Gagne

We all seem as administrators to be afflicted with "the managerial psychosis," wishing very much to be classified as "management." But what do we do as managers? We work with the unessential details of the schools. Only recently I learned from a study of the work habits of principals that 65% of the time of the educational administrator is spent devising the budget. Of the four managerial problems--direction, coordination, evaluation, and planning--in the ordinary school situation, only the first two are emphasized. We have not done creative thinking with regard to structuring evaluation and planning into the school organization. As managers, we do not manage to have much time for these functions.

I like the stress in Gagne's paper on linking research and development. Research has helped in the sense that it has produced evidence which has set off tensions within the school organization and has forced us to search for answers. We ought to require that research help identify impediments which prevent us from accomplishing our educational goals. It would be a move in the right direction if, instead of an Assistant Superintendent for elementary and secondary schools, we were to structure a department of Research and Development which would constantly evaluate our educational results.

Such a department could find out how other organizations throughout the country are solving problems, and could relay the information to local schools. It could be a superb resource for teachers and administrators attempting to cope with their dilemnas--a kind of master switchboard for educational development. The purpose of such a department would not be to solve the great theoretical issues but to plan significant educational interventions in the lives of youth. Our failure to respect valid research and to attack school problems with reasonable scientific precision is tragic.

We often forget that teachers are overextended and lack time for study, reading, and adequate preparation. Gagne is unquestionably right about individuality among students and the consequent need for teacher-diagnosticians, but diagnosis takes time. No teacher ought to be required to face kids more than three hours a day. The cost increase would of course be substantial--but if we can send rockets to the moon, we can surely convince communities to spend enough to secure good teaching.

I would make one final comment: the role of administrator is not to control and direct, but to find out where the weak spots are and find strategies to strengthen them. The administrator ought to be as much an investigator of weaknesses as a manager of corrections.

THE VOICE OF THE TEACHER: A SONG OF PROTEST

Gary Gschwind

Today a new force is evident in American education--the aggressive, militant and radical teacher. Tired of the administrative paternalism that has stagnated many of our schools, the militant teacher is everywhere increasing in numbers and influence. Last summer classroom teachers seized control of the powerful NEA, and that organization is now shedding its conservative image. What are the causes of this teacher militancy?

While there is no one cause, the chief element is the general rate of change in our society itself, which is creating pressures from government, business, and minority groups who demand that the schools produce solutions to our social and political ills. To the teacher these pressures and this era of change constitute a challenge, and he is beginning to demand powers and responsibilities commensurate with the new demands upon him and his profession.

There are other contributing causes. More men are now entering the teaching profession, not as a step to administration but because they wish to teach, and they are more aggressive and verbal than those recruited into teaching in an earlier day. Also, teachers of both sexes are better educated today, and they

naturally wish appropriate recognition of their years of training and professional competence. Related to this is their desire to be free of the piddling interruptions that are the lot of the American teacher, claiming all too much time that might be given to instruction or self-improvement.

The latter grievance found expression at a recent conference of the Association of Classroom Teachers in Washington, where the participating teachers listed the sort of non-teaching classroom duties to which they particularly objected. The list is a formidable one, and includes: preparing attendance reports; collecting money for fees, charity, parties, and so forth; keeping records; making reports; making home contacts; administering extra tests; supervising extra-curricular activities; performing custodial duties; and health screening. The teachers maintain that all of these activities could be performed by supportive staff at a considerable gain for instruction.

These are the points at issue in the growing controversy between militant teachers and the educational establishment, and they indicate that teachers are taking a new look at their roles and are not satisfied with them. The answer to this teacher pressure, as assessed by the national and state education associations, was to head off militant action by encouraging professional negotiations. But there is evidence that negotiations are too slow and tedious and do not offer timely answers to teacher problems. In one way or another, teachers have often been stalled at some point in the complicated negotiation process. Therefore, teachers are beginning to look to other means of

realizing their goals. A recent statement by the NEA Board of Directors suggests a sequence of mediation, fact-finding, arbitration, political action, and finally sanctions short of refusals to teach (strikes). The NEA believes that these procedures constitute an arsenal that makes the actual strike unnecessary, but they recognize that under certain conditions the strike may be the final and necessary step in this sequence. Thus the NEA has come to allow the use of organized power to achieve teacher goals, should all else fail.

Teachers do not want to strike. What they want is to be involved in the process of change, to work with peers in improving and developing curriculum and instructional practices and in guiding educational policy. In this new mood, they wish a principal who will listen and give assistance, not one who is critical and authoritarian. They want a superintendent who actively supports teachers in their drive to be at the center of educational change, not one who acts as a watchdog and a supervisor. This is the core of the protest of the militant teacher.

THE COST OF LEADERSHIP

Edward J. Meade, Jr.

The fundamental question underlying recent difficulties in education, of which teacher militancy is perhaps the most publicized, is the matter of school control. Who should run the schools? Who should bear the responsibility for their successes and failures? Should the public defer to the esoteric wisdom of the profession, or should it play an active part in determining the conduct of the schoolhouse?

Attempts to answer these questions must respect the basic postulate that education, far from being isolated from the public will, is and will continue to be a part of the fabric of public life. It serves vital public ends, whether that of overtaking the Russians or solving the problem of unemployment; the schools, after all, are public schools. What they do and do not do, therefore, must depend upon the national condition as well as upon the professional's estimate of what the child should learn. And whatever course we plot for our schools, we must remind ourselves that the school is a political system, and issues of policy and control are resolved through political processes. One of the concerns that gave rise to the resistance movement among teachers is precisely this question of governance. Having achieved greater political power, we may now be sure that

teachers will play a strong role, adding their preferences and beliefs to the debate over who shall control the schools.

In order to cope with the problem of governance, we must become more clear about the roles different people play in the system, particularly in its internal politics. The superintendent finds himself in these days of teacher militancy in an unclear terrain. He cannot represent the teachers, for his allegiances and obligations are different. But, rather than simply representing the board vis-a-vis the teachers, he has usually attempted to mediate between the two, with generally disappointing results. Whether the superintendent should function as the agent of the teachers or of the board is still debatable, but it seems clear that he cannot serve both masters. The principal, while an administrator, finds himself identifying more often with the teachers in his building than with the central administration. He has less real control over his teachers than commonly thought, and his role is more akin to that of the college dean than anything else. Yet he, too, is unsure of his relation to the organized interests he both leads and serves.

The issue of governance will not be settled by a happy togetherness, for despite the common interest of all parties in the education of the child, the division of labor between levels in the educational hierarchy makes conflicts inevitable. The political interplay will therefore involve teachers, administrators, the public-at-large and government.

As the militant teacher reaches for greater power over the affairs of the school, he would do well to remember that leadership

cannot avoid the onus of accountability. Whoever makes the decisions about what to include or exclude in the curriculum, about whether to impose restrictions on student dress, or whether to use team teaching, must expect to account to the public for the consequences of these decisions. But as teachers we are likely to be in a poor position if an accounting is demanded of us. Many of our decisions about schooling are based on custom, assumption, or mystique. When pressed, we are hard put to advise the public with any degree of accuracy on the relative merits of a class size of 33 or 25, much less speak authoritatively about the competitive advantages of spending $50,000 on football equipment or on additional floor wax. The usual teacher finds it difficult to defend his instructional actions with legitimate evidence, and he often does not really know why he practices his particular brand of pedagogy. Teachers interested in assuming greater power might consider that a greater share of control in instructional policy may be more trouble than it is worth. School issues are both intellectually and politically difficult and both the intellectual and political factors vary from place to place because of local conditions.

These reflections suggest three summary considerations. First, there is a need to establish a new kind of representative organization through which instructional decisions can be debated. The hostility of administrators to teacher demands is hard to defend and is useless, since increased teacher involvement is inevitable. Instead, administrators ought to provide a

representative forum for the expression of ideas from teachers, principals, citizens, and literally anyone else interested in affecting the course of the schools. This would afford the superintendent and the board a wide range of opinion on which to base their recommendations, and would allow teachers' unions to focus on their proper concerns with teacher welfare. Second, the superintendent should probably attempt to mediate impartially between teachers and the board of education, balancing conflicting points of view. Third, the public must become more involved in the schools, not less. At present there is no appropriate mechanism through which public involvement can be invoked. The PTA will not do, nor will teachers' unions or even boards of education. We must establish a medium through which the problems of the schools can be pondered, for they are essentially public problems. While there are dangers to uninformed authority and the bias of public opinion, in the long run the abuses resulting from increased public involvement will create less damage than the persistent isolation of the people. Despite occasional instances of book burning, moralistic constraints on books and teachers, and the like, we must assume that in the last analysis public sentiment will be reasonably sound. The public must be encouraged to debate the crucial issues of the school, to face up to what the schools can and cannot do, and to support the resulting instruction both in spirit and in dollars. The dilemmas of the ghetto and the burning of draft cards are not matters for curriculum committees; they are matters for society. The schoolman has enough to occupy his attention.

THE PRINCIPAL AND THE TEACHER: THE RISKS OF AUTONOMY

Louis J. Rubin

Whether they have a right to or not, teachers are demanding greater power over the educational policies of the schools, and all signs indicate that these demands will be actualized to a greater degree in the future. This means that we may expect a power shift with implications not only for those who will yield the power, but for the schools as a whole. What will be the consequences of the changing relationship between teachers and principals?

The type of demands by teachers that interests us here is not the matter of working conditions but the more difficult question of control over the instructional program of the school. An increase in teacher involvement in matters of instructional policy will probably not bring about any revolutions, inasmuch as the restrictions imposed by our knowledge and tradition will limit the ambitions of teachers much as it does those of administrators. Still we can expect the drive for increased teacher autonomy to have extensive consequences. While in the individual classroom the result--assuming the presence of a superior teacher--may well be improved instruction, the effect on the entire school may not be so favorable. Individual autonomy may, for example,

fragment instruction even more than it now is. In short, the fine distinctions between the art and science of teaching may be lost. Self-direction permits the interested and able individual to extend his effectiveness; in the case of the disinterested or the less able, however, it may result in a loss of effectiveness. At best, schools are rarely unified enterprises. Often, various individuals work at cross purposes, differ in educational beliefs and use conflicting teaching methods. Each classroom, because of idiosyncracies in teaching "style" and differences in teacher personality, is an island unto itself. The vertical sequence is haphazard, with teachers giving relatively little attention to what has come before and what is to come after. Horizontal coordination is imperfect, with teachers at the same level emphasizing quite different parts of the common program because of personal preferences and strengths.

Greater teacher autonomy, in view of these characteristics of all schools, can have a detrimental effect in spite of its other advantages. This is not to argue for a reduction of autonomy, but rather to emphasize the need for leadership which can prevent fragmentation from becoming a corollary of autonomy. It is one thing to invest personal creativity in accomplishing a designated end and quite another to create one's own ends. Thus the task of school leadership is to ensure that the organization's objectives, collectively determined, are pursued by the entire staff.

What then of the principal? What is enduring and what is altered in his relationship to the teacher? For the purposes of this paper--and to avoid tiresome quibbling about "leadership" versus "administration"--the principal is assumed to be the designated leader of the school. As such he has four predominating functions: (1) managing the routine operation of the school, (2) judging the worth of the school's objectives and the usefulness of the procedures used to accomplish them, (3) instituting new objectives which result in better education, and (4) initiating new procedures which make the school more efficient. It is unlikely that we shall be able to do without this kind of leadership in the foreseeable future, particularly in view of rising teacher autonomy. If, as we have been taught, authoritarianism is folly for administrators, it is also true but less frequently noted that a kind of "super-peer" relationship in which principals play the part of a warm, friendly colleague is equally ill-advised.

Leadership is offensive, not defensive, and if he is to be the leader the principal cannot serve as the friendly consort of teachers, but must align himself with the administrative-leadership forces in the system. But his leadership must be inventive and flexible, taking into account the situational limits on his influence, the individuals to be influenced, and the method best suited to his own leadership style. At times he will rely upon the power of his office, at times upon charisma and patronage. He will need to forearm himself with a clear set of precise objectives, a repertoire of

"influencing" devices, a willingness to create useful tension and conflict, and the fortitude to "manipulate" the human and non-human elements in the organization. But, it is important to note, teachers' best efforts cannot be commanded. Teachers will respond to leaders who are collaborative rather than dictatorial, who demonstrate obvious expertise, manifest ambitions and intentions which are honorable, and who are empathetic and compassionate human beings.

In sum, the principal's central responsibility and primary challenge is to serve as a facilitator of organizational renewal. As schooling becomes more complicated it is becoming clear that he cannot do everything himself; he has neither the time nor the varied, indeed, superhuman talents. He therefore must seek to facilitate the work not only of teachers but of the growing numbers of outside specialists, inspiring, sustaining, mediating. The essence of my argument is that the principal serves as a producer-director rather than as a performer. He must determine what must happen and see that it happens, supporting at every point a process which is complex, technical, and endless.

Lest facilitation suggest no more than a passive oiling of the wheels of the current machine, it is worth emphasizing that school <u>improvement</u> is the principal's job. Whatever his style and method, he must strive to create the incentive and desire to improve performance. He must give his energies to a constant appraisal of his organization, and he must insist upon renewal and change--intelligent, purposeful, but to the complacent,

irritating change. Thus his leadership must be offensive rather than defensive, and it must develop a lasting obsession for the better way.

Ole Sand
Comments on Rubin

With all that we manage to say or write about education, there are no easy answers. While I agree with most of Rubin's paper, there are a number of points where I would enter a small dissent. In the first place, the very theme of the Conference is badly stated. We are called to discuss "The Frontier in School Leadership," but this assumes that the school is the only significant educational institution. But if, as I prefer, we change the title to "The Frontier in Educational Leadership," we are recognizing that the school doesn't provide the child's whole education. Edward Meade recently put this very well in a paper entitled "Expanding the Community of Education." I would prefer that Superintendents of Schools change their titles to Superintendents of Education, and school principals to Principals of Education. We can't solve our problems with the school going it alone. There are many institutions in the community vitally involved in education, supplementing the efforts of the school. Acutally, all kinds of leaders should have participated in the Conference if my point were accepted--parents, clergy, community leaders, and so on. We need to broaden the concept of those thought to be legitimately concerned with education.

Concerning the principal, I think it is a mistake to

over-emphasize the <u>position</u> of the principal as the source of his effectiveness. The principal is not the leader because of his position, but because of his function. Leadership is not command over, but power with.

One final thought. At one point Rubin stated that the test of success of the principal is the behavior of the students; I would submit that instead it is the improvement of the quality of life in the community--its values and how well it lives up to them.

THE TWO WORLDS OF ADMINISTRATION AND LEADERSHIP: THE IDEOLOGICAL CURTAIN

Norman J. Boyan

As do all complex organizations, schools and school systems require both leadership and administration. Administration is concerned with the required performance of roles, but because organizations function under continuing demands for systemic change, as Katz and Kahn tell us (1966), the routine performance of roles is not enough; leadership must be added to administration. Leadership is the "influential increment over and above mechanical compliance with routine directives" (p. 302).

Katz and Kahn differentiate among three types of leadership: (1) that involving policy formulation, which includes structural change; (2) that involving improvisation, or extending (or altering) the existing structure; (3) that involving administration, or utilizing existing structure. Leadership, then, is a higher form of behavior than administration, although both are necessary to the survival of organizations.

According to the Katz and Kahn typology, five types of power are associated with the office of leadership: legitimate power, punishment power, reward power, expert power, and referent power. The latter two, expert and referent power, depend on personal properties rather than formal definition. Their exercise is particularly appropriate in the schools,

where faculties share many of the characteristics of instructional professionals. For professionals should be subjected to the authority of competence rather than position--in other words, to referent or expert power, rather than the forms of power based upon coercion.

The Extended Principalship

With the preceding remarks on leadership and administration as background, we may consider a structural design for realizing the greatest potential leader behavior in the position of secondary school principal. The design assumes: that intellectual development is the primary purpose of the school and personal and social development the secondary purpose; that each requires a separate form of organization; and that these separate organizations should be integrated by appropriate interstitial levels.

In organizing for instructional services, we establish a division of instructional services based upon the academic department and supported by divisions of pupil personnel services and managerial services. (The latter two divisions are diagrammed to the sides of and small than the central division, as its task is primary.) The principal serves the instructional division as dean of faculty. The emphasis of his work is on continuous examination and assessment of existing structures and procedures, and upon formulating and improvising policies where the existing structure falls short of securing organizational goals. He exercises his influence

on the instructional staff through the curriculum associates, who are associates of the principal with both teaching and managerial functions, and who provide an interstitial level uniting the technical and managerial staffs. Curriculum associates will be both instructional specialists and subject-matter specialists. In the former capacity the curriculum associate works with probationary teachers diagnosing instructional problems, prescribing remedies, and ultimately recommending the probationer to the principal for promotion. In working with post-probationers, the curriculum associate influences senior colleagues through his competence alone. He is then concerned with curriculum development and the continuous refinement and application of performance criteria. His relationship to senior colleagues is not hierarchical but collegial, and his authority rests upon "expert power" rather than upon the power of punishment, legitimate power, or reward power.

In organizing for personal and social development, we suggest a framework of schools within schools. The emphasis here is on development rather than simply discipline or conformity, although of course certain levels of cohesion and solidarity are necessary to permit the school to function. The school within a school provides sub-units with which the individual may easily identify, encouraging group solidarity but remaining a unit of optimal size for promoting personal and social development. Here the student participates in school government, student clubs and intra-mural sports, assembly

programs, journalism, and the like. The sub-school should be headed by a "dean," who is in many ways analogous to the curriculum associate in the academic department. The Dean teaches part-time, but his technical expertise is in personal and social development of pupils.

Instructors in the larger school organization would hold membership in both departments and in the sub-schools. But to the sub-schools alone would belong counselors, whose responsibilities are in the area of discipline and whose expertise resides in the area of discipline and rehabilitation.

The center of this proposed organization is the "extended principalship," a component position including the principal, curriculum associates, and the director of pupil personnel services (who might hold the title of assistant principal), and finally the sub-school deans. The extended principalship serves to articulate the organization for instruction and the organization for personal and social development. It is designed to allow the principal to exercise expert power in the direction of genuine leadership, not merely routine administration. But the design requires, as a sine qua non, a principal who <u>wants</u> to equip himself with the skills and competence necessary for the challenge of school leadership.

Charles Moody
Comments on Boyan

I am concerned about several of the assumptions which are the basis for the model of the extended principalship. The chief problem arises with the assumption that teachers have become more expert in content and method; if they have, it has certainly not been at the rate society demands. There is a kind of demand curve for expertise, and such growth as teachers have made has fallen below that demand curve. And if this is true, the model we need ought to be generated to accommodate the inadequacy of teacher competence in terms of need.

Another assumption that bothers me is that the increasing skill of teachers requires organizational changes of both teachers and administrators, as they are now organized collectively and vis-a-vis each other. A number of forces are pressing us to change, forces such as kids in New England marching on the schools asking, as Gary Gschwind said, for "a piece of the action." Despite its seductive appeal, the increase of teacher competence is easily exaggerated as one of these forces. As I observe teachers, there are a number of modes of teacher behavior. Some wish to share in the action, and some are hard at work developing their expertise, but others are interested primarily in security, and they

serve to retard change. Their motto seems to be, "Don't make waves."

Finally, the "extended principalship" model makes the distinction between primary and secondary tasks of the schools, and assumes that there are options available for concentrating resources and energy on primary tasks at the expense of secondary ones. If anticipated changes do occur in the schools so that students and teachers in fact "get a piece of the action," this could greatly change the relationship of the "primary" and the "secondary" tasks. New arrangements might reverse these two priorities. Perhaps the best way out of this dilemma is to regard intellectual development and social/personal development as <u>coordinate</u> tasks, rather than as contending for primacy in the school's mission.

THE FRONTIER IN SCHOOL LEADERSHIP: GENTLEMEN, START YOUR ENGINES

Abraham S. Fischler

School leaders must analyze new goals in American education, and must follow their analysis by altering curriculum and teaching strategies as well as the organization of the schools in order to accomplish desired goals. My purpose here is to describe some of the new goals and to discuss their implications and applications.

It seems to me that we must strive to produce a self-directed learner, one capable of seeking out information for himself. Not only does the self-directed learner seek out the knowledge and skills he needs, but he has a clear set of priorities to enable him to concentrate his efforts. He is capable of utilizing feedback from his environment to determine correctness of decisions. He derives self-satisfaction from seeing a task well done.

If we accept goals of this sort, then the schools must modify their aspirations. Students must begin to direct their own scheduling to some extent, and teachers must become goal setters and diagnosticians rather than informers or tellers. To enable students to move at their own pace, it is essential to have a continuous progress program, selecting from a rich resource environment those inputs which enable the students to

reach the stated goals. Insofar as possible we must indicate our educational objectives ahead of time so that students can self-test in order to determine whether they have achieved the desired competence. With minimum levels of performance specified at the point of entry, students could proceed sequentially and carefully through a series of learning activities leading to the accomplishment of the goals.

Stating goals in behavioral terms has been developed in the Nova Public Schools Complex (Fort Lauderdale, Florida) under the term "Learning Activity Packets." Each learning activity packet is developed around a major concept, which is broken into sub-concepts. These concepts are then broken down into behavioral objectives. After students proceed through the basic core there is a self-assessment portion, where the student judges his own competency. After the self-assessment he can either proceed to the teacher evaluation, or, if he feels himself unready, can return to the core of the packet. In the core, readings are supplemented by tapes, films, film strips and other laboratory resources. Children do a great deal of their work in the resource centers provided in each of the fields. The learning activity packets are sequenced from the first grade through the twelfth, with all students carrying English, Mathematics, Social Studies, Science, Foreign Language and Technical Science throughout their school career. The essence of the system is that students set their own pace, spending a great deal of time in some areas, operating at minimum levels in others. Teachers monitor student progress, but students with rational basis for

their selected rate of progress are allowed to pursue their own interests--fostering a mature kind of decision-making.

Under such a system the administrator encourages teaching which recognizes individual differences, and provides resources which enable teachers to remove themselves from the center of the classroom. This is administrative leadership at its best, emanating from stated goals and supplying teachers and students with the wherewithal and support to change the system in ways that facilitate the realization of those goals.

CONFERENCE SUMMARY

The Conference on "The Frontier in School Leadership" reflected the unsettled world of American education, giving rise to a wide spectrum of concerns, analyses and prescriptions. In places, however, there was astonishing unanimity among the participants. Every speaker seemed to agree that the pace of recent social change had brought the schools to a crisis. Technological innovation, teacher militance, the proliferation of knowledge, pressures on the schools to adequately prepare the young for a complicated society and to do so more expertly and quickly than in the past--all of these have emphasized the urgent need for improvement in education in America. It is no surprise to find educators agreeing on the need for improvement, but the unanimity on the need for urgency was both unexpected and striking in its intensity.

Opinions conflict, of course, over how to get change--and more importantly, over how to get <u>improvement</u>. During the Conference there was repeated discussion of the exaggerated claims that have been made for "research" as the quick panacea to the school's problems. Getzels pointed out that "more raw data" is not the sort of "research" that will answer our questions, for we have had much of that in the past few years, and, as Goodlad noted, instruction in the schools is still pretty much what it was twenty years ago.

Both Guba and Gagne joined in these complaints about today's haphazard "research" efforts, noting how little actual improvement had resulted from recent expenditures of time and money.

Such criticisms nonetheless stem from a commitment to a scientific approach to school improvement. Many of the participants, after debasing what passes for scientific research into education, sought to identify the sort of operational knowledge we need. The overwhelming thrust of these papers was toward inquiries aimed at understanding the change process itself, research guided by theoretical precepts and ultimately aimed at the creation of viable strategies for changing the prevailing conception of what school leadership should do. Judging by the papers read at this conference, the attention of educational scholars is shifting from the substantive to the procedural, from the collection of data about administration and management, and teacher backgrounds and the like, to a concern with organizational life and especially organizational change.

Three scholars concentrated their inquiry on leadership which produced organizational structures in which improvement was encouraged. Goodlad described the League of Cooperating Schools, where a countervailing system sought to facilitate change within existing school systems; Guba outlined a national organizational structure designed to translate research findings into actual improvements in the schools; and Boyan outlined an administrative arrangement for eliciting the best innovative ideas of administrators and teachers alike. All of these were leadership models within which improvement was encouraged and institutional rigidities were minimized.

While there was enthusiasm for such model-building, at the same time there were many reminders of the difficulties of using drawing-board solutions for problems of such immense complexity. Margaret Gill, for example, felt that what worked in John Goodlad's Los Angeles area would need to be modified to accommodate local conditions elsewhere, and Richard Foster credited most of the success in his own district to a deliberate disdain for strict organizational arrangements. Thomas spoke for those who were more impressed with the intractable differences among schools and school personnel than with the similarities upon which all model-building is based. These and other comments conveyed a note of pessimism about the prospects for quick improvement through structural alterations based upon theoretical models, apparently based on the bitter lessons of the past decade--lessons about the diversity and also the essential conservatism of the American school system. The Conference produced no one ready to go so far as Kenneth Clark, James Coleman or McGeorge Bundy, who seem to have despaired of the existing system entirely and suggest that education be turned over to private enterprise, the federal government, unions, ghetto parents, and so on. Yet the results of the extensive post-war efforts to improve American education have fostered substantial doubts about the ability of theory to quickly alter practice.

Virtually all of the recommendations for improving educational systems, whether based upon new organizational arrangements, the old organizational arrangements, or some sort of anti-organization, projected an important role for the principal.

Changes would not eliminate the principal; indeed, they would come largely by his efforts, for he was cast in a leadership role by speaker after speaker. It was acknowledged that the principal in the past has been a specialist in maintenance, not improvement. As Goldhammer put it, of the four tasks of the principal--direction, coordination, evaluation, and planning--the principal rarely gets beyond the first two because of the press of routine work. He spends on the average, Goldhammer said, 65% of his time working out the budget! Many speakers also identified the pressure of routine work as the major factor stifling evaluation and improvement, both personal and institutional. (Teachers are also harried by details and thereby barred from self-improvement, Gschwind and others made clear.)

But the principal must not be abandoned to managerial routine. The conferees insisted that he honor his evaluative and planning duties more than in the past. Frequent reference was made, notably by Rubin and Goldhammer, to enlarged staffs of specialists, working under the principal's direction, performing tasks both instructional, clerical and technical in order to free principals for their leadership functions. If the principal comes to value leadership behavior, and if he were supported by the right organizational changes, he could then accomplish what no one else in the educational world could do equally well: judge organizational performance continuously and arrange for required improvements. As Rubin put it, the principal's duties should not be limited to mediation and

management; he must also serve as the "entrepreneur" who diagnoses needs, experiments with correctives, and negotiates renewal.

It may have been reassuring to the Conference participants to learn of the strong commitment among scholars to the future of the principalship. But they could not help but sense also the enormous demands of the future. Whether the principal is to relinquish his managerial role, or whether he is to serve both leadership and managerial functions, the description of the kind of school leadership envisioned, wherein every procedure must be constantly under review emerged as a task of sobering proportions. And leadership by dictum apparently will not do. All agreed that the authoritarian relationship was destructive, that both teachers and students must be "led" with compassion and accorded the respect and autonomy that is any professional's due. Permitting this increased autonomy might seem to complicate the problems of coordination, but, if observers like Richard Foster are right, the only route to change is through teacher enthusiasm, and the only way to teacher enthusiasm is through more collegial, informal relationships between faculty and administration. Commentators, drawing upon both "research" and unsystematic experience, declared that influence comes from competence, not merely from positional authority. The principal was asked not only to delegate some of his duties, but to earn the right to those he retains--and they would be considerable--through expertise and competence.

As might be expected, the transition to such a relationship is difficult. Commentators such as Edward Meade spoke of the role-confusion among administrators in an educational world where the issue of governance is so thoroughly unsettled. But changes must be made, and, if the Conference evoked representative sentiments, they should be welcomed.

The frontiers in school leadership are clearly marked. While we often hear that in times of stress leaders will emerge, such a faith seems unduly optimistic. It is also common to assume that men of good will and commitment will achieve more good than harm. Here too, while the notion is not without truth, good intentions are a necessary but certainly insufficient basis for effective leadership. The frontier which perhaps more than any other demands exploration is that concerning the nurture of leadership. While natural leaders may be born with the required raw ingredients, the skills of every leader can be developed, and in some cases, to a remarkable degree. We know far too little about the behavior which lends effective leaders their success. Within the same frontier of unknowns, we know far too little about the particular attributes which make a leader successful in one situation and a failure in another. Many of the ideas voiced at the seminar suggest that we can solve these unknowns, not only by our usual approach through empirical research, but also by encouraging a kind of trial-and-error experimentation in the field.

A second frontier concerns the targets leaders should recognize. The proper business of leadership is less clear

than one might imagine. Whereas some administrators presume their fundamental task to be judging the worth of their organization's objectives and the success of the organization in achieving these objectives, others are more inclined to regard themselves as facilitators, aiding the individuals within the organization in the achievement of their ends. Still others feel that the crucial task is that of establishing connective tissue between the organization's goals and those of the individuals working within it. If one can judge by the discussions which ensued at the seminar, the speakers seemed to advocate a concept of leadership which embraces all three of these, but which emphasizes stewardship as the primary administrative responsibility. The effective leader, in short, is an individual who arranges the organization's operation so that materials, human resources, incentive, and structure are correlated in a thrust toward organizational achievement. Nevertheless, knowledge about the goals to which leaders should aspire is scant.

A third frontier lies in our superficial understanding of leadership skills per se. We do not seem to know why some people have a capacity to lead and others a willingness to follow. We have an even more inadequate perception of the skills of command. Excellent leaders obviously make use of a kind of general finesse. But, in the absence of insights regarding the particular capabilities which comprise such finesse, we are unable to do very much about their development. While the debates at the seminar centered largely upon the

school principal, there was repeated reference to the leadership of supervisors, directors of instruction, and superintendents.

Finally, there is a real need to investigate the frontier which surrounds the processes of influencing people. What strategies, under what conditions, best influence people to modify their behavior? What are the comparative benefits and liabilities to coercion, seduction, persuasion, and inspiration? What should be accomplished through authoritative mandate and what through charisma? Leadership can be either a positive or a negative force. Hitler and Churchill were not only of the same generation, but their capacity to inspire and to invoke followers, despite their diverse objectives, was profound.

Leading American schools toward better performance will take all the intelligence educators and the community can bring to the task--but that is not all it will take. A practical note was heard among the many fine theoretical sounds. Taking advantage of technology, retraining teachers, hiring supplementary staff, and providing for really individualized instruction will all cost enormous amounts of money. Guba's system of components for the utilization of research findings would alone cost close to one billion dollars.

One of the speakers probably spoke for the rest when he made it clear that educators pressing for school improvement were aware of these costs and did not regard them as an excuse for deferring needed action. As Dean Goldhammer bluntly put

it, a country that can put rockets on the moon can certainly find the resources to properly educate its children. We are beginning to discover how difficult school improvement really is. But schoolmen are preparing for the thrust, working to acquire a knowledge not only of leadership but of the ways in which it can be best put to use.